

*The Institute of Asian and African Studies
The Max Schloessinger Memorial Foundation*

Offprint from

JERUSALEM STUDIES IN
ARABIC AND ISLAM

30(2005)

S. Sviri

**The early mystical schools of Baghdad and Nīshāpūr
or: in search of Ibn Munāzil**

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

THE EARLY MYSTICAL SCHOOLS OF BAGHDAD AND NĪSHĀPŪR: IN SEARCH OF IBN MUNĀZIL*

Sara Sviri
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

قال روم : لا تزال الصوفية بغير ما تنازروا فإذا تسألكوا واصطلحوا فلا خير فيهم .
الخرковي ، تهذيب الأسرار ، ١٩٩٩ ، ٥٢٢

A. Introduction: Al-Khargūshī's *Tahdhīb al-asrār*

The present work follows several lines of enquiry: it is an attempt to amend an enduring graphic error committed by a long line of scribes, as a result of which two historical personalities, 'Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak and the less known 'Abdallāh b. Munāzil have become confused; to reinstate the figure of the latter, an early mystic from Nīshāpūr; to restore the significance of the *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, a nearly-ignored fourth/tenth-century work on Ṣūfi lore; to map, albeit in rough lines, the routes and affiliations that connected the early mystics of Baghdad and Nīshāpūr; to outline a methodology for textual interpretation with which Ṣūfi literature should be approached; to comment on the current state of research

*This article is a follow up of previous studies: a chapter on the Malāmatiyya in my doctoral dissertation on al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī (Tel-Aviv University, 1979 [in Hebrew]); "Hakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmati* movement in early Ṣūfism" in L. Lewisohn (ed.), *Classical Persian Ṣūfism: from its origins to Rūmī* (London and New York, 1993), pp. 583–613; my review of von Schlegell's *Principles of Ṣūfism*, (a translation of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla*), *JSAI* 19 (1995): 272–281.

I wish to thank Prof. M.J. Kister for alerting me to al-Khargūshī's text and for allowing me to use his photocopies of the Berlin MS.; to Prof. Sabine Schmidtke who helped me in obtaining a microfilm of the Berlin MS; to Prof. M.A. Amir-Moezzi who alerted me to the Abū Dhābi edition of al-Khargūshī's work and who read the draft and offered useful comments as well as encouragement; and to the Institute for Advanced Studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, whose generous support during 2003 has facilitated this work. I also wish to thank Prof. Etan Kohlberg, Prof. Sarah Stroumsa, Dr. Ella Almagor and Dr. Avraham Hakim for their generous help and comments at various stages of writing this paper.

in the field of Islamic mysticism; and, last but not least, to ponder the true way of performing the *hajj*. If this program sounds absurdly presumptuous, let me defend it by expressing the hope that, in the course of this paper, the interdependence of all the above topics will be shown.

Some years ago I was given by Prof. Kister three bound folders containing the photocopies of a manuscript from Berlin. The title page of the Ahlwardt 2819 MS (originally Sprenger 832 from the Königliche Bibliothek zu Berlin) identifies the text and its author as *Kitāb tahdhīb al-asrār li-‘Abd al-Mālik b. Abī ‘Uthmān al-Wā‘iz al-Kharkūshī*,¹ the English description beneath the Arabic title introduces it as “System of Qūfism by Kharkūshy, 580pp Copied in 848.” In Ahlwardt’s catalogue there is a detailed account of the work’s chapters. It is introduced as “Darstellung des Qūfismus in 70 Kapiteln von ‘Abd elmelik ben moh. ben ibrāhīm elharkūsī i ennīsāburī abū sa’d †406/1015.”² For some years I did not consult the text. Recently, however, in contemplating a methodology for the study of early Ṣūfi compilations, I have undertaken an examination of al-Khargūshī’s work, and have found it surprisingly rich with material and information unfamiliar to me from other sources. Having examined it closely, I find this material vital for the deepening of our understanding of the formative period of Islamic mysticism; especially the nature of the local mystical schools during the 3rd/9th-4th/10th centuries and the way these schools became gradually integrated into the amalgamated ethical-mystical movement known as Ṣūfism. What adds significance to al-Khargūshī and his Ṣūfi *Darstellung* is the fact that he is a contemporary and a compatriot of al-Sulamī: both are 4th/10th century residents of Nīshāpūr. Moreover, their journey down the mystical path followed the same teachers: al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī lists among al-Khargūshī’s teachers Ismā‘il b. Nujayd, Bishr b. Aḥmad al-Isfārāīnī,

¹ On Abū Sa‘d (or Sa‘īd) ‘Abd al-Mālik b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Wā‘iz al-Khargūshī, a Shāfi‘ī scholar with mystical leanings, who died in Nīshāpūr in 406–7/1015–16; see Sezgin, *GAS* (1967) 1:670 1 (no. 52); for a detailed and well researched account of al-Khargūshī’s life, teaching and work, see Dawood Sulayman ‘Abd al-Rahman’s doctoral dissertation, *A Critical Edition of Kitāb Sharaf al-Muṣṭafā by Abū Sa‘d... al-Kharkūshī* (University of Exeter, 1986), pp. 2–29 and pp. 95–107; also Uri Rubin’s doctoral dissertation, *Muhammad the Prophet in the early literature of ḥadīth* (Tel-Aviv University, 1976), vol. 2, pp. 371ff; to the biographical sources mentioned there add al-Qazwīnī, *Āthār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-‘ibād* (Beirut, 1960/1380), p. 401; Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam al-buldān*, Wüstenfeld (ed.), (Leipzig, 1867), vol. 2, pp. 325–6 (Kharkūsh); also Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Sarīfīnī (d. 641/1243), *Muntakhab min al-siyāq li-ta’rīkh Nīshāpūr* (excerpts of a Persian work based on al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī’s *Ta’rīkh Naysābūr*) — a facsimile edition published by Richard Frye in *The Histories of Nīshāpūr*, Harvard Oriental Series No. 45 (The Hague, 1965), f. 94b.

² W. Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss der Arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1891), pp. 6–7 (I have reproduced the transliteration of Ahlwardt’s catalogue).

'Alī b. Bundār al-Šūfī, and Abū Sahl al-Šu'lūkī. Both Ibn Nujayd and al-Šu'lūkī played an important role in the life of al-Sulamī: the former, the closest disciple of Abū 'Uthmān al-Hīrī (for many years the head of the *malāmatiś* of Nīshāpūr), was his maternal grandfather, adopted him and gave him his name (al-Sulamī was the mother's family name) and was responsible for his religious education; while the latter actually initiated al-Sulamī into the mystical path and gave him a license to teach.³ The place of al-Sulamī as a major source for the study of early Islamic mysticism has been established in numerous studies and scholarly editions of his books and treatises.⁴ As for his Qur'ān commentary, the *Haqā'iq al-tafsīr* — "this treasure-trove of contemplative Sūfi thought" — scholars unanimously acknowledge its import.⁵ The fact that al-Khargūshī stems from the same locality as al-Sulamī (the latter was, in fact, a somewhat younger resident of Nīshāpūr), as well as from the same social and religious milieu, and that in assembling Sūfi anecdotes and dicta they occasionally make use of the same informants,⁶ all lend al-Khargūshī's work weight and make for a rewarding study. Thus it seems evident from the outset that the juxtaposition of *Tahdhīb al-asrār* with the well-known works of al-Sulamī will enhance our familiarity with those individuals who shaped Islamic mysticism at its formative period, will add vitality and complexity to the portrayal of their ideas, and, most importantly, will facilitate the tracing of the lines of affiliation along which they were grouped.

It is, therefore, curious that Sūfi scholarship has taken little notice of al-Khargūshī and of his *Tahdhīb al-asrār*.⁷ A.J. Arberry, who had

³ See al-Khatib al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rīkh Baghdād*, vol. 10, p. 431, no. 5594; also Jāmī, *Nafāḥat al-uns* (Tehran, 1337sh), p. 311.

⁴ See the introductions to the following editions: N. Shurayba, *Tabaqāt al-sūfiyya* (Cairo, 1953), pp. 11–53; M.J. Kister, *Ādāb al-ṣuhba wa-husn al-'ishra* (Jerusalem, 1954) pp. 1–8 and 3–16; J. Pedersen, *Kitāb tabaqāt al-Sūfiyya* (Leiden, 1960), pp. 19–38; E. Kohlberg, *Jawāmi' ādāb al-sūfiyya* and *'Uyūb al-nafs wa-mudāwātūhā* (Jerusalem, 1976), pp. 7–18; S.I. Ātesh, *Tis'a kutub fī usūl al-tasawwuf wal-zuhd li-Abī 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī* (Beirut, 1993), pp. 51–140; N. Pourjavady, *Majmu'a-*

⁵ See F. Meier, "Ein wichtiger Handschriftenfund zur Sufik," *Oriens* 20 (1967): 106; Kohlberg, *op. cit.*, p. 7 notes 7, 9; Nwyia, *Trois oeuvres de mystiques musulmans* (Beirut, 1986), pp. 25–32; G. Bowering, *The mystical vision of existence* (Berlin and New York, 1980), pp. 110ff; *idem*, "Sūfi hermeneutics in medieval Islam," *Revue des études islamiques* 55–57 (1987–89): 256ff; *idem*, "The major sources on Sulamī's minor Qur'ān commentary," *Oriens* 35 (1996): 35ff; for the disapproval of Muslim scholars, however, see Kister, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10; also Nwyia, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–160, note 3; G. Bowering, "Sūfi hermeneutics," p. 262.

⁶ For the interesting example of Abū Naṣr Maṇṣūr b. 'Abdallāh, see below around note 30.

⁷ Note, however, the doctoral dissertations devoted to al-Khargūshī's *Sharaf al-muṣṭafā*. See note 1, above.

consulted the Berlin MS at the India Office Library in London (now part of the British Library), gave a short and rather uncomplimentary description and evaluation of the text and its author.⁸ Yet in the sixty odd years that have passed since Arberry made his observations, only a small number of scholars have referred, rather fleetingly, to the work, primarily Louis Massignon⁹ and Paul Nwyia.¹⁰ Exceptional in rectifying this perplexing oversight is the work of Naṣrallah Pourjavady, whose recent article in Persian on the *Malāmatiyya* relies heavily on *Tahdhīb al-asrār*.¹¹ In most textbooks and studies on Islamic mysticism, one looks in vain for a reference to or a citation from al-Khargūshī's work.¹²

Arberry's paper opens with the comment that, as a compiler of Sūfi lore, the date of al-Khargūshī's death — 1015 or 1016¹³ — places him earlier than al-Sulamī (d. 1021), al-Isfahānī (d. 1039) and al-Qushayrī (d. 1072) but later than al-Sarrāj (d. 988), al-Kalābādhī (d. 995) and Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 996). "These comparisons are important," remarks Arberry, "for they show Khargūshī as being a sufficiently early writer in the genre of systematic Sūfism" (*op. cit.* p. 345). It is *vis-à-vis*

⁸ *BSOAS* 9 (1937–39): 345–349.

⁹ See L. Massignon, *Essay on the origins of the technical language of Islamic mysticism* (Notre Dame, 1997), p. 220: Appendix, reference to MS Berlin, f. 180a; *The Passion of al-Hallāj* (1982), vol. 4, p. 16 — al-Khargūshī appears as no. 180 in Massignon's Bibliography; he is described as Malāmatī, theologian, Ash'arī; see also vol. 1, p. 39 — al-Khargūshī is mentioned here as a "pro-Hallājian Shafi'iite" (based on what?), 93, 609 (citation of a saying by Hallāj as to What is Sūfism); vol. 2, pp. 4, 107, 118, 462; vol. 3, pp. 107, 115, 177, 181, 227, 253, 256, 277, 337, 348.

¹⁰ *Exégèse coranique et langage mystique* (Beirut, 1970), pp. 27, 34, 158, 163, 164.

¹¹ See "manba'-i kohan dar bāb-e malāmatiyan-e Nīshāpūr", *Ma'ārif* 15 (1998/1377): 3–50 (my thanks go to Prof. Pourjavady for his article and to Dr Julia Rubanovich for reading it with me). To the best of my knowledge, Pourjavady is preparing a scholarly edition of the *Tahdhīb*.

¹² I have consulted Nicholson, (see note 14); Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, 1975); A. Knysch, *Islamic Mysticism* (Leiden, 2000) — note the detailed sixth chapter on "The systematization of the Sūfi tradition", pp. 116–149 (esp. Table 3, p. 149); Jawid A. Mojaddedi, *The biographical tradition in Sūfism* (Richmond, 2001); William Chittick, *Sūfism. A short introduction* (Oxford: OneWorld, 2000); Bernd Radtke, "Theologen und Mystiker in Khurāsān und Transoxania", *ZDMG* 136 (1986): 536–569; R. Gramlich (editor and translator), *Das Sendschreiben al-Quṣayrīs über das Sufitum* (Wiesbaden, 1989); Kāmil Muṣṭafā Shaybī, *al-Sila bayna al-tasawwuf wal-tashayyu'* (Beirut, Dar al-Andalus, 1982) (3rd edition); even Fritz Meier, whose seminal article on "Khurāsān and the End of Classical Sūfism," English translation in *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism* (1999), pp. 189–219 (originally in German, in *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema La Persia nel Medioevo* [Rome, 1971], pp. 545–70), is, perhaps, the first attempt to outline a systematic approach to the historical study of early Sūfism, does not refer to it there (or, for that matter, in any of the articles and essays brought together in *Essays on Islamic piety and mysticism*).

¹³ Arberry refers to Brockelmann (*Supp.*, vol. 1, p. 361) "with the authorities there quoted."

this biographic detail that Arberry rightly expresses his surprise that al-Khargūshī “is not included in Nicholson’s list of eight authorities for the history of early Sufism”¹⁴ and that “he does not appear to have received the attention which he deserves.” Arberry singles out Massignon, who has used al-Khargūshī’s *Tahdhīb* in his study of al-Hallāj (*ad loc.*)¹⁵. He then sets out “to supplement the somewhat exiguous account of the work given by Ahlwardt, and also to estimate the true value of al-Khargūshī’s manual as a primary source.” What follows is a brief, unflattering description of the text at hand. To begin with, Arberry doubts the reliability of al-Khargūshī’s transmitter, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Shirāzī. Basing his judgment on al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī who has marked al-Shirāzī as a weak (*da’if*) authority on *hadīth*, Arberry concludes that “His reputation does not inspire confidence” (p. 346).¹⁶ Arberry’s doubts as to the reliability of the text are enhanced by the fact that in ff. 10b–11a of the Berlin MS he finds a long saying attributed to ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilī, which can be nothing but an interpolation to the original text, since ‘Abd al-Qādir died in 561/1166.¹⁷ As for the work itself, he claims that “the structure of the *Tahdhīb al-asrār* follows so closely that of [al-Sarrāj’s] *Kitāb al-luma’*, that there can be no reasonable doubt that Khargūshī (or his editor) took Sarrāj, without the slightest acknowledgement, as a model... page after page bears witness to plagiarism (pp. 347–8).” Now, without digressing into a lengthy response to the charge of plagiarism in Sufi or other medieval writings, it seems to me that most scholars, especially those who avidly pursue ‘parallels,’ will concur with the following statement: “Concepts such as ‘authorship’ and ‘plagiarism’ did not exist in the Middle Ages. Before 1500 or thereabouts people did not attach the same importance to ascertaining the precise identity of the author of a book they were reading or quoting as we do now”.¹⁸ It seems that a

¹⁴ See Nicholson’s introduction to his edition of al-Sarrāj’s *Kitāb al-luma’* (Leiden, 1914), pp. i–ii.

¹⁵ For a fuller, more updated list of Massignon’s works in which he refers to the *Tahdhīb*, see above, note 9.

¹⁶ It goes without saying that if we were to appropriate such verdicts from “orthodox” scholarship, the works of most Sufi authors would be denounced as weak and unreliable — cf., for example, the opposition to al-Sulamī recorded by al-Subkī, *Tabaqāt*, vol. 3, p. 60 and see note 5 above.

¹⁷ More on this see below in the Appendix on Bāriūd’s edition, note 122.

¹⁸ Goldschmidt, E.P. *Mediaeval texts and their first appearance in print* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1943), p. 88; cf., however, Vardit Tokatly’s forthcoming paper “Three Mamlūk Scholars Go to War on Plagiarism: Literary Theft in Arabic Prose as Discussed by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 1448), al-Sakhawī (d. 1497) and al-Suyūṭī (d. 1505),” *JSAI* 31 (2006) — my thanks go to Dr. Tokatly for this reference and for discussing “plagiarism” in medieval Islam with me; it should be noted that the texts adduced by Dr. Tokatly belong to the late medieval period and, compared with earlier literary norms, may indicate a cultural change.

somewhat superficial examination of chapter headings and a few pages was sufficient for Arberry to conclude his article with a scathing verdict (which, one might add, is at odds with his initial positive remarks): “... it will be evident that the *Tahdhīb al-asrār* is not to be assigned to the same rank as a primary source for the history of Sufism as that occupied by the works of Sarrāj, Makkī, Kalābādhī and Qushairī....”¹⁹ Whether it was Arberry’s sentence that caused scholarship to shy away from consulting al-Khargūshī’s work or it was just an unfortunate oversight is hard to tell. Al-Sulamī, regardless of the fact that he, too, was the object of Arberry’s misgivings,²⁰ has fared much better among the scholars.

The omission of the *Tahdhīb al-asrār* from the study of the early formative phases of Islamic mysticism seems to me more than an inadvertent oversight. It reflects the state of research in which, in spite of decades of study by eminent scholars, no proper methodology for approaching early Sufi literature has been set up or proposed. It has been my contention that the formative period of Islamic mysticism cannot be properly described without an attempt to map the affiliations that connected individual mystics of this period to one another.²¹ Although the distinction between the mystical trends of Baghdad and Khurāsān has long been acknowledged, albeit along lines which are not necessarily backed up by the textual evidence,²² Sufi literature reflects a far greater complexity of practices, interchange, exchange and movement than has hitherto been recognized. The study of divergences and distinctive affiliations in the history of Islamic mysticism has been carried out mainly concerning the later Sufi *tarīqas*. But, in fact, Sufi compilations of the 10th–11th centuries, particularly when read with affiliations in mind, also reveal multiplicity and variegation in social set-ups and codes of practice as well as in points of doctrine. Such a reading breaks up the linear continuity of the Sufi text, groups together sayings and anecdotes from a variety of sources (according to their authors and transmitters in the first place and according to their subject matter in the second place), uses the tools of the biographical and historical literature not only in order to offer a catalog of the individuals mentioned in sayings and anecdotes, but in order to review the socio-historical and local context of their activities and thus place them in their proper *Sitz im Leben*. Such a reading is, it

¹⁹ P. 349.

²⁰ That Arberry was intent on pointing out so-called plagiarisms in Sufi works can be shown by his “Did Sulamī plagiarize Sarrāj?” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1937): 461–465.

²¹ See S. Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* Movement in Early Sufism,” (1993), pp. 583–4.

²² See my review of von Schlegell’s *Principles of Sufism*, *JSAI* 19 (1995): 274.

seems to me, as significant for the understanding of Islamic mysticism as the attempt to describe the didactic, theoretical and phenomenological aspects of Sufism on the basis of pious, devotional or ecstatic sayings in isolation.

For the advance of such a methodology, al-Khargūshī's *Tahdhīb* is indispensable. Far from being a second-hand plagiarism of al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb al-luma'*, it contains an enormous stock of anecdotes and traditions covering hundreds of mystics and pious men from both Baghdad and Khurāsān and spanning the 2nd/8th–4th/10th centuries. Although I have not carried out a systematic comparison between the *Tahdhīb* and the *Luma'*, I have compared the material in these works pertaining to the 3rd/9th century Ibrāhīm al-Khawwāṣ, chosen at random from among the less central Sufi figures: al-Sarrāj has collected twenty-eight items on him and al-Khargūshī twenty-five; out of these, only four are clear parallels. This haphazard comparison goes some way to suggest that al-Khargūshī was no mere copyist or, worse, plagiarist, of al-Sarrāj. Another example of an account that al-Khargūshī includes in his compilation, for which a parallel is yet to be found, is a grim anecdote concerning the grandchild of al-Hakīm al-Tirmidhī. In *Bāb fī dhikr al-firāsa*, al-Khargūshī demonstrates the extraordinary gift of foresight (or intuition) possessed by Abū Bakr al-Warrāq and a certain Muḥammad b. Ḥātim al-Tirmidhī (possibly the former's disciple). The two, together with many other shaykhs, were invited to a banquet that Muḥammad b. ‘Alī (= al-Hakīm al-Tirmidhī) threw for the blessing of his (newly-born?) grandchild. Abū Bakr and Ibn Ḥātim, the narrator, having looked at the child, decided unanimously to refrain from blessing him. And indeed, this child, as the narrator tells us, turned out to be “the most wicked person of his time and the greatest blood shedder” (*kāna azlāma al-nās fī ‘aṣrīhi wa-asfakahum li-l-dimā’*). He became a warlord and was killed at the gates of Jurjān while drunk.²³ Was it out of deference for al-Hakīm al-Tirmidhī that this story was suppressed and was not adopted by other authors? This is a matter for speculation; but, on firmer ground, this remarkable anecdote, which I have not yet been able to trace in any other compilation, suggests that the *Tahdhīb* contains supplements to what has been hitherto available to students of Sufism through other, better known, authors such as al-Sarrāj, al-Sulamī, al-Qushayrī and others.²⁴ A detailed and systematic scrutiny of al-Khargūshī's Sufi compilation is, therefore, a desideratum.

²³ Ed. Bārūd, p. 327

²⁴ For another unique piece concerning al-Shiblī and Ibn Munāzil, see below, section D and E.

B. Shī‘is in Nīshāpūr

There are two religious movements that existed in Nīshāpūr for which the evidence of the *Tahdhīb* is particularly valuable: first, the mystical-ethical trend known as the Path of Blame (the *Malāmatiyya*) and second, Shī‘ism, in particular that aspect of the Shī‘ī tradition that was incorporated into Sufi lore. Concerning the first trend, I have given elsewhere a detailed account of the *Malāmatiyya*, also known as the “Nīshāpūrī path” (*madhab ahl Naysābūr*).²⁵ In section C I shall attempt to bring into relief, with the help of the *Tahdhīb*, the obscure and often confused figure of an eminent *malāmatī*, ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil and, intrigued by a unique story included in the *Tahdhīb*, I shall also try to trace his affiliations not only with the Nīshāpūrī circle, but also with the Baghdādī one, in particular with al-Shiblī.

As far as the Shī‘ī perspective is concerned, the *Tahdhīb* throws new light on the question of the Shī‘ī material that became included in Sufi literature, and it affords new insights concerning the time and place at which this inclusion took place and shape. Since the pioneering work of Paul Kraus, Louis Massignon and Paul Nwyia,²⁶ and the ongoing research of Gerhard Böwering²⁷ concerning the inclusion of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq’s exegesis within al-Sulamī’s Qur’ānic commentary *Haqā’iq al-tafsīr*, we know how significant the sixth Imām’s exegetical tradition had been for the development of early Sufi vocabulary and thought. It has become common knowledge that Shī‘ī tradition, in particular the tradition that bears the name of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, became part of the non-Shī‘ī mystical lore included in the teaching of Sufism.²⁸ It now

²⁵ See S. Sviri, “Hakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* movement in early Sufism,” pp. 583–613.

²⁶ See P. Kraus, *Jābir b. Ḥayyān. Contribution à l’histoire des idées scientifiques dans l’Islam* (Cairo, 1942–43), vol. 1 and 2 — see indices; see Nwyia, “Le *Tafsīr* mystique attribué à Ga‘far Ṣādiq,” *Mélanges de l’Université Saint Joseph* 43 (1967): 181–230; J.B. Taylor, “Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, spiritual forebear of the Sufis”, *Islamic Culture* 40 (1966): 97–113.

²⁷ See G. Böwering, “Sufi Hermeneutics,” pp. 255–270; also *idem*, “The major sources of Sulamī’s minor Qur’ān commentary,” *Oriens* 35 (1996): 35–56.

²⁸ See Massignon, *Essay*, pp. 138ff; *idem*, “Die Ursprünge und die Bedeutung des Gnostizismus im Islam” in *Opera Minora*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1969), pp. 499–513; H. Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, livre IV, “Shī‘isme et soufisme”; Nwyia, *op. cit.*; *idem*, *Exégèse coranique et langage mystique* (Beirut, 1970); H. Halm, *Die islamische Gnosis. Die extreme Schia und die ‘Alawiten* (Zürich-Münich, 1982); Böwering, “The Major Sources,” *Oriens* 35 (1996): 51ff et passim; F.S. Colby, “The subtleties of the Ascension: al-Sulamī on the Mi‘rāj of the Prophet Muhammad,” *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002): 167–183; note also the place of the Shī‘ī Imāms — notably from ‘Alī to

emerges that al-Khargūshī, too, includes in the *Tahdhīb* many traditions that stem from the Shī‘ī Imāms. Interspersed within his chapters on *ma‘rifa*, *shawq*, *mushāhada*, *yaqīn*, *murāqaba*, *wara‘*, *zuhd*, *ṣabr* — as well as other chapters whose headings reflect the ethical-mystical terminology associated with Sufism — one finds scores of sayings and anecdotes pertaining to ‘Alī, al-Hasan, al-Husayn, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, ‘Alī b. Mūsā al-Ridā and other dignitaries of the *ahl al-bayt*. One is particularly struck by the number of traditions which portray the Shī‘ī Imāms as paragons of generosity (*sakhā‘*) and good character (*husn al-khuluq*). Now, when we consider that al-Sulamī and al-Khargūshī were contemporaries, and that both were schooled and brought up within the same milieu, namely that Nīshāpūrī milieu named by Richard Bulliet “the Patricians of Nīshāpūr,”²⁹ it seems only plausible to suggest that the Shī‘ī material adduced by both authors bears witness to a local Nīshāpūrī tradition, in which the values of exemplary etiquette, a religiosity that is inwardly-oriented, as well as the terminology that conveys these values and attitudes, were shared by Shī‘īs and non-Shī‘īs alike.

This suggestion is corroborated by historical sources. A Shī‘ī community, consisting of distinguished descendants of ‘Alī and the Imāms, descendants of dignitaries exiled there in the 2nd/8th century existed in Nīshāpūr. Relevant material can be gleaned from al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī’s *Ta’rīkh Naysābūr* (or, rather, from its various summaries and citations from it scattered in both Sunnī and Shī‘ī *a‘lām* literature).³⁰ Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī’s work, as well as subsequent works based on it, in particular the first facsimile in Frye’s edition,³¹ is vital for cross-checking information on Nīshāpūris associated with the early ethical-

al-Husayn and through to ‘Alī al-Ridā, the eighth Imām (on whom see below) — in some early Sufi *silsilas* (lines of transmission) — see J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford, 1971), p. 262; also al-Shaybī, *al-Sīla*, pp. 467–471 (incorporating the 19th century Shī‘ī scholar al-Hājj Ma‘ṣūm ‘Alī’s *Tarā’iq al-haqā‘iq*). For several of the above references I am indebted to Prof. Amir-Moezzi.

²⁹ See next footnote.

³⁰ See Richard Frye, *The Histories of Nīshāpūr*; see also R.W. Bulliet’s ethnographic study based on Frye’s facsimiles, *The Patricians of Nīshāpūr, a Study in Medieval Islamic Social History* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1972); for the influx of Shī‘īs into Khurāsān following Zaydī risings, see Andrew J. Newman, *Naṣr Manṣūr b. ‘Abdallāh* (mentioned by both al-Sulamī and al-Khargūshī) who, possibly in Nīshāpūr, may have been a transmitter of Shī‘ī teachings, in particular those of or on Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, see Böwering, “The major sources,” *Oriens* 35 (1996): 47f. and 50–51; also Aghā Buzurg-i Tīhrānī, *Tabaqāt a‘lām al-Shī‘a* (Beirut, 1390/1971), p. 327 (Böwering, p. 47 note 71); see also below note 35.

³¹The first facsimile in Richard Frye’s *The Histories of Nīshāpūr* which is entitled *Kitāb aḥvāl-i Nīshāpūr*, is identical with the text published by Bahmān Karīmī (1337sh); see Frye, “Introduction/The Texts”, pp. 10–13.

mystical movements. Among the residents of Nīshāpūr who belong to the fourth generation after the Prophet, al-Ḥākim lists “Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn ‘Alī b. Mūsā b. Ja‘far b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib al-Ridā Abū al-Ḥusayn.”³² In an atypical manner, deviating from the pattern of succinct summaries which are attached to most referents, the information on the eighth Imām extends over several lines. It tells us that al-Ridā arrived in Nīshāpūr in the year 200/815–6 and that in 203/818–9 he was summoned by al-Ma’mūn to Merv and was then martyred in Sanābād in the vicinity of Tūs. It then goes on to cite a saying concerning a soteriological promise made by al-Ridā to anyone who visits his tomb.³³ In *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, the eighth Imām features as a model of modesty and good character. In *Bāb fī dhikr husn al-khuluq*, al-Khargūshī tells, without an *isnād*, how ‘Alī b. Mūsā, who was black skinned,³⁴ was mistaken in the *ḥammām* for the bath attendant and assumed the duties of the attendant (*ḥammāmī*), rather than putting the matter right.³⁵

In the *talkhīṣ* of *Ta’rīkh Naysābūr*, in the chapter devoted to the tombs and shrines of Nīshāpūr which have become sites of pilgrimage (*mazārāt*), we find that in the cemetery of the Amīr ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir there was an enclosure (*hażīra*) dedicated to the tombs of *ahl al-bayt*. Here, in a sacred garden (*rawḍa muqaddasa*), was the tomb of the martyred “imām” (here, no doubt, in the general sense of “leader”) Muḥammad b. Ja‘far b. al-Ḥasan³⁶ b. ‘Alī b. ‘Umar b. al-Ḥusayn b. [‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib] Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn. Most interestingly, according to this

³² See Frye f. 12a = Karīmī, p. 26.

³³ See Ibn Qūlawayhi al-Qummī (d. 368), *Kāmil al-ziyārāt* (Qumm: Nashr al-faqāha, n.d.), al-bāb 101, p. 506: مَنْ زَارَ عَلَى بَعْدِ دَارِيٍّ وَشَطَوْنَ قَالَ أَبُو الْحَسْنِ الرَّضا عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ: مَنْ زَارَ عَلَى بَعْدِ دَارِيٍّ وَشَطَوْنَ مَرْأَيِيْ أَئِمَّتِيْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فِي ثَلَاثِ مَوَاطِنٍ— قال الرَّضا عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ: «أَلَا فَمَنْ زَارَنِي فِي غَربِيِّ بَطْوَسٍ كَانَ مَعِيْ فِي «أَلَا فَمَنْ زَارَنِي وَهُوَ يَعْرِفُ مَا أَوْجَبَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى؛ إِذْ رَجَعَ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ مَغْفُورًا لَهُ» من حقِّي، فَانَا وَابْنِي شَفَاعَوْهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ—» (Beirut, 1985), p. 371:

³⁴ His mother was a Nubian slave-girl; for the custom of the Shī‘ī Sayyids to marry black slave-girls out of modesty and humility in contrast to the Caliphs, see al-Khwārizmī, *Rasā’il* p. 81; cf. Mas’ūdī, *Muṛūj al-dhahab*, Ch. Pellat (ed.) (Beirut, 1979) vol. 4, ch. 100, p. 42. For interesting material concerning ‘Alī al-Ridā’s ascetical leanings and links with early ascetics, see al-Shaybī, *al-Sīla*, pp. 236ff.

³⁵ MS Berlin f. 107b–108a = Bārūd’s ed. p. 219; cf. al-Sulamī, *Kitāb al-futuwwa*, سَمِعَتْ الْحَسِينَ بْنَ نَصَرَ يَقُولُ: عَنْ عَلَيِّ بْنِ مُوسَى يَقُولُ: الرَّضا رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ يَقُولُ: سُلَّمَ حَصَرَ بْنَ مُحَمَّدَ > الصَّادِقَ < رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ يَقُولُ: الْمُتَوَّهَّ—لِيَسْتَ بِالْمُتَوَّهَّ بِالْفَسْقِ وَالْفَجُورِ وَلِكُنْتَ التَّوَّهَ طَعَامَ مُصْنَعَوْنَ وَنَائِلَ مَدْنَوْلَ وَبَثَرَ مَقْبُولَ وَعَقَافَ مَعْرُوفَ وَأَدِيْ مَكْفُوفَ— interestingly, this tradition concerning the nature of *futuwwa* (= chivalry — see below around note 44), is reported to al-Sulamī by Manṣūr b. ‘Abdallāh, on whom see above, note 30.

³⁶ Text: al-Ḥusayn.

source, the *laqab* of this individual was Abū Ja‘far al-Ṣūfī.³⁷ In the *Tahdhib*, al-Khargūshī mentions one Abū Ja‘far al-Naysābūri al-Ṣūfī, but there is no way of identifying him with this Shī‘ī leader.³⁸ Rather, this Muḥammad b. Ja‘far (nicknamed Karkān?) may perhaps be identified as a follower of the Jārūdiyya branch of the Zaydīs,³⁹ who had led in Mecca a revolt against al-Ma’mūn in the year 199/814–5, and was then captured and sent by al-Ma’mūn to Khurāsān. This Abū Ja‘far was probably the son of Ja‘far b. al-Hasan al-Nāṣir, whose *laqab* was al-Dībāja.⁴⁰ Al-Shaybī cites al-Fāsi’s *Shifā’ al-gharām bi-akhbār al-bayt al-ḥarām*, according to which Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq [sic!],⁴¹ whose *laqab* was al-Dībāj, used to attend prayer in Mecca with two hundred men of the Jārūdiyya; *they were wearing wool and the signs of goodness were*

³⁸ See *Tahdhīb*, ed. Bārūd, p. 27.

³⁹ For the Jārūdiyya, see al-Mas'ūdī, *Murāj al-dhahab*, vol. 4, p. 45; the Jārūdiyya was the only branch of the Zaydiyya who considered 'Alī as the rightful successor of the Prophet Muhammad; see H. Halm, *Shiism* (Edinburgh University Press), p. 206.

⁴⁰ See al-Shaybi, *al-Sīla bayna al-taṣawwuf wal-tashayyu'* (Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1982) (3rd edition), p. 189; cf., however, Andrew J. Newman, *The formative period of Twelver Shi'ism*, p. 36, where a certain Muhammad b. Ja'far b. al-Ḥasan, a Zaydī, rose in Rayy in 252/866–7 against the Tāhirids; see also *al-Irshād* by al-Shaykh al-Mufid (trans. Howard, 1981), pp. 432–434. It seems that this Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ja'far (nicknamed Karkān?) was the son of Ja'far b. al-Ḥasan al-Nāṣir, and that this Ja'far's *laqab* was al-Dibāja; see Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī, *Lubāb al-ansāb*, p. 66; there seems to be a confusion as to which one of those whose name was Muḥammad b. Ja'far was nicknamed al-Dibāja: according to al-Nawbakhtī, *Fīraq al-Shī'a* (Najaf, 1959), pp. 97–98, this was also the nickname of the son of the sixth Imām, Ja'far b. Muḥammad; al-Bayhaqī, too, mentions Muḥammad al-Dibāj as one of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq's sons; see *ibid.*, pp. 28, 68 et passim.

⁴¹ See the previous note.

manifest upon them" (my emphasis — S. S.).⁴

Another descendant of the House of 'Alī, who, according to the *talkhīṣ*, was buried in the Tlagird (?) cemetery of Nīshāpūr, is Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. The same person is mentioned also in a later section entitled "The names of the great ones who are buried in the town of Nīshāpūr cited from the writing of Khwāja Qutb al-Dīn."⁴³ Here it is related that he was a "chivalrous" youth (*jawānmard*)⁴⁴ known as Abū Shakhtawaih and that he was one of the martyrs of former years. We are also told that his tomb is a shrine where prayers are answered (تربة او محل احابت دعاست). The *talkhīṣ* mentions also Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh and his eldest son Muḥammad b. Muḥammad whose *lagab* is *ziyāre* or *ziyāde* (should probably be *zubāre*),⁴⁵ the chief of the Sayyids of Khurāsān (*naqib-e sādāt-e Khurāsān*). "These two noble ones and their children and grandchildren," we read, "are buried in the 'Abdallāh Ṭāhir cemetery which is called the Cemetery of the Sayyids."⁴⁶

This evidence concerning noble Shī‘is in Nīshāpūr is thought provoking. Reflecting over the evidence culled from the cluster of al-Sulamī,

⁴² See al-Shaybī, *ibid.*: **وكان الأئمة الزيديون - كزير - مجموعة من الزهاد المتقشفين**, بيل كان [مهمهم من يلقب بالصوفي كمحمد بن يحيى بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عمر بن علي بن أبي طالب الذي قتله الشهيد محبوساً (مقاتل الطالبيين، ٤٤٨)]، وكان محمد بن جعفر الصادق، اللقب بالذريج، يخرج إلى الصلاة عباقة < في سنة ٢٠٠ (١٥١٦ـ)>: **بماشي رجل من المخارودية وعليهم ثياب الصوف وسيماء الخير ظاهر (نفس المصدر، ٥٤) إلى آخره، الفاتياني، شفاء الغرام باخبار البيت الحرام، ١٨٥٩، ١٨٩٢**، وكان ثائر زيري آخر يوصف بالصوف وهو محمد بن القاسم - لأن كان يدمن لبس الشياطين من الصوف الأبيض (مروج الذهب، ٤١٠:٢). In *Murūj al-dhāhab*, vol. 4, ch. 115, paragraphs 2799–80, Muhammad b. Qāsim is indeed described as practicing in Kūfa extreme asceticism and piety, but there does not appear to be a reference to wearing wool.

⁴³ Karīmī, p. 151.

⁴⁴ The Persian term *jawānmard*, ‘[chivalrous] youth,’ equals the Arabic *fatā* and relates to the ethical virtues of *jawānmardī* or *futuwwa*; for the complex notion of *futuwwa*, see L. Massignon, “La ‘Futuwwa’ ou ‘Pacte d’honneur artisanal’ entre les travailleurs musulmans au Moyen Age,” in *Opera Minora* vol. 1, pp. 396–421; H. Corbin, “La chevalerie spirituelle,” in *En Islam iranien*, vol. 4, pp. 390ff (for this reference I am indebted to Prof. Amir-Moezzi); Muhammad Ja‘far Mahjub, “Chivalry and early Persian Sufism,” in L. Lewisohn (ed.), *Classical Persian Sufism from its origins to Rūmī* (London and New York, 1993), pp. 549–581; also al-Shaybī, *al-Silah bayna al-tasawwuf wal-tashayyu‘* (1982), pp. 515–553. All these studies highlight the association of the Shī‘ī tradition with the ideal of *futuwwa*; cf. F. Meier, “Khurāsān and the end of classical Sufism,” in *Essays on Islamic piety and mysticism*, p. 217; also Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* movement in early Sufism” (1993), pp. 602–604 and the literature mentioned there; see also above, around note 35.

⁴⁵ Probably بَارِةٌ زَبَرَةٌ; as, according to Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī's *Lubāb al-ansāb*, were the chieftains (*nuqabā'*) of Nishāpūr; see the chapter on them in vol. 2, pp. 492–523.

⁴⁶ این دو شریف بزرگ واولاد و احقاد ایشان رضی الله عنہم در مقبره عبدالله طاهر اندو آنرا — گورستان سادات گفتندی see Karimi's edition, p. 149 [= f. 70].

al-Khargūshī, and the Nīshāpūrī chronicles, one ponders the conjunction of the following: a) among the descendants of *ahl al-bayt*, who had been exiled to Khurāsān in the 2nd/8th century, there were those who settled in Nīshāpūr and who became distinguished inhabitants there; b) the possibility that some of these distinguished settlers of *ahl al-bayt* may have carried on in Nīshāpūr their pious and ascetic practices, associated with Ja'far b. al-Hasan al-Dibāja and the Jārūdiyya, for which they may have earned the *laqab* Ṣūfi; c) al-Khargūshī, like his better-known contemporary and compatriot al-Sulamī, has included in his *Tahdhīb al-asrār* scores of sayings and anecdotes emanating from *ahl al-bayt*; and d) the *futuwwa*, that highly ethical chivalrous movement, which has characterized the Nīshāpūrī-Malāmatī mystics, has been associated also with Shī'ism and its idealized image of 'Alī and the Imāms as *fityān*.⁴⁷ The conjunction of these points prompts us to propose that it was in Nīshāpūr that a common Ṣūfi-Shī'i tradition had developed — in ethics, exegesis, devotion and spiritual conduct, but not in theology and doctrine.

To sum up my conclusions thus far: there is no doubt that, for the study of the origins, complexity and development of the early mystical schools in Nīshāpūr, and for the understanding of their openness to Shī'i ethical ideals, norms of conduct, and terminology, the *Tahdhīb al-asrār* is as important a source as al-Sulamī's works. I am convinced, therefore, that works by these two authors — their *matn* as well as their *isnādāt* — should be studied in conjunction with pertinent chronicles and hagiographies. We should, I believe, review the perspective from which these two Nīshāpūrī Ṣūfi authors — and later on al-Qushayrī too — write: their perspective is *still* local, immersed in Nīshāpūrī traditions and attitudes, while they are *already* at a juncture from which an integrated and all-embracing movement of Ṣūfism is envisaged and promoted by the very same authors and educators.⁴⁸

C. 'Abdallāh b. Muṇāzil and the Nīshāpūrī path of blame

Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Ibn Muṇāzil, according to al-Sulamī's *Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, was a disciple of Abū Ṣāliḥ Ḥamdūn al-

⁴⁷ See al-Shaybī, *op. cit.*, pp. 521ff, and esp. 525–527; see also al-Sulamī, *Kitāb al-Futuwwa*, pp. 8–10; it is worth noting that, according to al-Sulamī, the prophetic line of the *futuwwa* bearers is transmitted by Muḥammad to 'Alī, nominating him as its custodian for the post-prophetic era.

⁴⁸ See Sviri's comments in her review essay, "B.R. von-Schlegell, trans. *Principles of Sufism by al-Qushayrī*", *JSAI* 19 (1995): 273–275; see also the end of section E. below.

Qassār and one of the most eminent masters of Nīshāpūr. He was particularly respected and admired by Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī. He died in Nīshāpūr in the year 331/942–3.⁴⁹ He was versed in the study of *hadīth* (al-Sulamī mentions a *hadīth* narrated to him by his own father).⁵⁰ According to what was reported to al-Sulamī by his own father, Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī, Ibn Muṇāzil's admirer, died, in 328/939–40.⁵¹ Al-Sulamī tells us that Abū 'Alī met (*laqīya*)⁵² both Abū Ḥafṣ and Ḥamdūn al-Qassār, that is to say, the two Nīshāpūrī teachers who were associated with the *malāmatī* teaching in Nīshāpūr. Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī later abandoned the legal sciences ('ulūm al-shar') in which he had been a leader (*imām*) in favor of the mystical science ('ilm al-ṣūfiyya)⁵³ and excelled in his discourse on the blemishes of the self and the faults of actions⁵⁴ (*kāna ahsana al-mashāyikh kalāman fi 'uyūb al-nafs wa-afāt al-a'māl*). This earned him a double-edged rebuff from Ibn Muṇāzil, who said: "Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī should have discoursed with his own self (i.e., in the sense of admonishing it) rather than with (other) people; this is why he does not attain to the blessings of his own words."⁵⁵ This rebuff is congruous with the twenty-first *malāmatī* principle, which al-Sulamī introduces in

⁴⁹ Al-Sulamī, *Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, ed. Pedersen (Leiden: Brill, 1960), p. 376; see also al-Khalīfa al-Naysābūrī, *Talkhiṣ ta'rīkh Naysābūr*, ed. Karīmī, pp. 66–67 = Frye, f. 31a–32b; 'Aṭṭār, *Tadhibat al-awliyā'*, R.A. Nicholson (ed.) (London and Leiden, 1907), vol. 2, pp. 107–109.

⁵⁰ On al-Sulamī's father association with Ibn Muṇāzil, see below, note 82.

⁵¹ *Tabaqāt*, p. 370; the date of death is corroborated in the *Talkhiṣ ta'rīkh Nayshābūr*, ed. Karīmī, p. 70 — the information concerning Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī was, apparently, submitted to al-Hākim al-Naysābūrī directly by Abū 'Alī's grandson, Abū 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Thaqafī. According to him, Abū 'Alī was born in Qūhistān in the year 244 and died in Nīshāpūr in 328 where he was buried in the Qizz cemetery. Al-Hākim mentions him as الامام المقدى به في الفقہ والكلام والوعظ والورع والعقل والدين. Later on in the *talkhiṣ*, Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī al-Naysābūrī is mentioned among the طبقات المشايخ, who were buried in Nīshāpūr: Abū Ḥafṣ al-Haddād, Abū 'Uthmān al-Hīrī, Ḥamdūn al-Qassār and others; see pp. 149–150.

⁵² The verb *laqīya* probably implies that he was their contemporary and met them, but was not considered their disciple; in the latter case, the verb *sahība* is customarily used. Cf., however, al-Qushayrī, *Al-Risāla fi 'ilm al-tasawwuf* (Cairo, n.d.), p. 26, where the verb *sahība* is used.

⁵³ Cf. al-Qushayrī, *ibid.*, where Abū 'Alī al-Thaqafī is introduced as the one through whom Ṣūfism appeared in Nīshāpūr: وَبِ ظُهُورِ التَّصْوِيفِ بِنِيَّابُورِ؛ for interesting observations concerning the Nīshāpūrī teachers, see F. Meier, "Khurāsān and the end of classical Ṣūfism," in *Essays on Islamic piety and mysticism*, pp. 189–219.

⁵⁴ For the problematic notion of "actions" and "abandoning actions" (*tark al-a'māl*), see Sviri, review of von Schlegell's *Principles of Sufism* (a translation of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla*), *JSAI* 19 (1995): 278f.

⁵⁵ *Tabaqāt*, p. 378: كان الواجب على أبي الثقفي ان يتكم لنفسه لا للخلق لذلك ليس يصل اليه يركات كلامه؛ cf. al-Qushayrī, *ibid.*, p. 97 (*Bāb al-sidq*); wherē an illuminating anecdote concerning a "confrontation" between al-Thaqafī and Ibn Muṇāzil is related to al-Qushayrī by his own teacher Abū 'Alī al-Daqqāq.

his *Risālat al-Malāmatiyya*; according to it “One of their principles is to refrain from talking and showing off in matters of knowledge.”⁵⁶ It also ties in with Ibn Munāzil’s outspokenness, reflected in the following anecdote, which is recorded in untypical detail by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūri. In this anecdote, narrated by Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Mulāqabādhī, another *malāmatī* from Nīshāpūr, three Nīshāpūris — the narrator, Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī, and Ibn Munāzil — set out on a pilgrimage together. Upon their arrival in Baghdad, al-Mulāqabādhī and Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī express a wish to pay a visit to the renowned local shaykh, Abū al-Qāsim al-Junayd. Ibn Munāzil, however, declines and stays behind. When on the next day, and despite their enthusiastic impressions and the explicit invitation extended to the three of them by al-Junayd, he again declines, they insist on an explanation. This is what he says:

Beautiful speech is like excellent food: it goes into a man’s mouth and then the surplus goes out. The same applies to mystical knowledge (*ilm al-ma’rifah*): God throws the best [piece of knowledge] into the [interior of] someone He chooses, then what comes out through his tongue and what God makes him express is its worst [part]. I would rather forego the chance of meeting Abū al-Qāsim [al-Junayd] than be tricked into receiving from him the worst bit, while the best remains with him.⁵⁷

The two companions, astounded at his blunt explanation, return to al-Junayd, who enquires about their friend. They tell him what he has said. Abū al-Qāsim bursts out weeping, almost loses consciousness, and keeps silent throughout the entire visit.⁵⁸

This story goes some way to portray the rigorous introversion with which Ibn Munāzil, following, no doubt, the teaching of his master Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār, lived out his spiritual life. On Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār, whose full name is Ibn ‘Umāra Abū Ṣalīḥ Ḥamdūn b. Aḥmad, al-Sulamī tells us in the *Tabaqāt* that he was the Shaykh of the *Ahl al-Malāma* of Nīshāpūr; that of all his disciples no one adopted his particular method more seriously than ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil;⁵⁹ that he died in Nīshāpūr

⁵⁶ See ‘Afīfī, p. 112.

⁵⁷ ان كان امر ابي القاسم على ما وصفتموه فما مثل ما تسمعون منه الا مثل الطعام الطيب يتناوله الرجل ثم يخرج فصله على ما ترون، وكذلك علم المعرفة اثنا يلقي الحق الى من شاء من خلقه له طيبة ثم لا يخرج بسلام ولا ينقطق الحق الا بارداً، فلا ان تكون متبعاً الحظ بالكلية من ابي القاسم احب الي من ان تكون مغبوناً اخذ منه اردى ما القى ويقى طيه عنده.

⁵⁸ Frye, f. 32 = Karīmī, p. 67.

⁵⁹ Cf. al-Qushayrī, *ibid.*, who describes Ibn Munāzil as the shaykh of the *Malāmatiyya*.

in the year 271/884–5, and that he was buried there in the cemetery of al-Ḥira.⁶⁰

From these references and anecdotes we derive some preliminary notion as to the affiliation that bonded these men of Nīshāpūr and the complex nature of this affiliation.

Now we arrive at the thorny question of the confusion surrounding the identity of ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil. The solution may be buried in the ruinous streets, quarters and cemeteries of 9th-10th centuries Nīshāpūr, but the information that can be culled from their remains is ambiguous and confusing. The *Ta’rikh Naysābūr*, citing from Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn,⁶¹ gives a list of the “Names of the great ones who are buried in Nīshāpūr” (pp. 151–153) among whom, in the cemetery of ‘Abdallāh Tāhir,⁶² we find the names of Ḥamdūn Qaṣṣār, Abū ‘Alī Thaqafī and ‘Abdallāh b. Mubārak [!]. (p. 153). But a few pages earlier, in the section on the tombs of holy men who became places of pilgrimage (*mazārāt*) in Nīshāpūr, the same source gives the following names: Ḥamdūn Qaṣṣār, Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī, ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil and Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Aḥmad al-Būshanjī (p. 145). Evidently, we are dealing here with a scribal error: the graphic similarity of مبارك and مازل clearly produced this confusion and the reading should, without doubt, be simply amended to ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil. But the graphic similarity, coupled with an identical forename, created an enduring and persistent blunder which caused even careful editors to err. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak was an illustrious *zāhid*, one of the early ascetics for whom all biographers have nothing but praise.⁶³ He was born in Marw al-Rūdh and died in 181/797–8, during the reign of al-Rashīd, in Hīt, a town on the shores of the Euphrates. Classical hagiographies, such as *Hilyat al-awliyā'*, portray him as a saintly man who traveled widely in search of knowledge and who became an exemplary authority in the fields of *ḥadīth*, law, and morality. Ṣūfī compilations give account of many of his sayings, whose authenticity is above suspicion. What, then, can be more natural for a text relating of holy men and mystics than to appropriate him whenever a likeness to his name crops up? Examples of cases in which such confusion is more than likely abound. I shall confine myself to a few: in al-Khargūshī’s *Tahdhīb*, in *Bāb fī dhikr al-Malāmatiyya*, two sayings which should, undoubtedly, be attributed to Ibn Munāzil are assigned

⁶⁰ For the quarter of al-Ḥira in Nīshāpūr, see Sviri, “Ḥākim Tirmidī and the *Malāmatī* movement in early Ṣūfism,” p. 585 around note 5 and the sources mentioned there; see also Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids*, p. 166.

⁶¹ I was unable to identify him.

⁶² The eponym of the Tāhirid dynasty.

⁶³ The list of authorities writing on him is long; for references see Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. 1, p. 95 and many more references in the index.

— as evidenced by both the Berlin MS and Bārūd's edition — to Ibn al-Mubārak:

وَحَكِيَ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْمَارِكِ أَنَّهُ قَالَ: أَصْلُ الْمَلَامِتِ أَنَّهُ لَا يَظْهُرُ خَيْرًا وَلَا يَضْمُرُ شَرًا⁶⁴ — “The essential rule of the *malāmatī* is not to show goodness and not to hide wickedness”; and also:

وَقَيلَ لِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْمَارِكِ: هَلْ تَكُونُ لِلْمَلَامِتِ دَعْوَى؟ قَالَ: وَمَلِكُونَ لَهُ شَيْءٌ⁶⁵ — “Does the *malāmatī* have any claim? He answered: ‘Does he own anything that he could have a claim on?’”

It is their *malāmatī* contents that make it clear that these sayings should be re-assigned to ‘Abdallāh b. Muñāzil.⁶⁶ Our knowledge of the early *malāmatī* school of Nīshāpūr derives from a cluster of sources.⁶⁷ Foremost among them is al-Sulamī's works. In al-Sulamī's *Risālat al-Malāmatīyya*,⁶⁸ there are three references to either ‘Abdallāh: on p. 90 the text reads ... قال عبد الله بن المبارك حين سئل عن الملامة ... In a footnote ‘Afifi comments that there exists another version of this saying, in which the reading is ... قال عبد الله بن منازل حين سئل ... This version, he tells us, is reported by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Farrā’. ‘Afifi goes on to say, “**وهذا هو الصحيح، لا ابن المبارك الصوفى التوفى سنة ١٨١**”, but he does not offer any reference to al-Farrā's version. In al-Fāwī's edition of 1985,⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Bārūd's edition, p. 39 = MS Berlin f. 12a.

⁶⁵ Bārūd's edition, p. 40 = MS Berlin f. 12b.

⁶⁶ Note that Pourjavady is more cautious and regards the 2nd century Ibn al-Mubārak as an early *Malāmatī* — see “*Manba‘-i khuan...*”, *Ma‘ārif* 15 (1998), 12; he also argues for the possibility that, even if Ibn al-Mubārak of the ‘*malāmatī*’ texts is not identical with the 2nd/8th century ascetic, there may still have existed in Nīshāpūr, in the circle of Ḥamdūn, another person bearing the same name. Pourjavady brings to bear al-Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, vol. 4, p. 115 (on the basis of Ibn al-Jawzī's *al-Mudhish*) to show that there existed six men named ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak: one from Marw al-Rūdh, one from Khurāsān, one from Bukhara, one from Jawhar and the rest from Baghdad — see Pourjavady, *op. cit.* pp. 38–39. I opt for the simpler solution of assuming an enduring graphic mix-up between the two names, a solution that is, at the same time, the *lectio difficilior* of the two names. I also believe that the examples I adduce, and the many more that could be adduced, where the same saying is attributed at times to Ibn Muñāzil and at times to Ibn al-Mubārak, strengthen my argument; note, for example, al-Sulamī, *Ādāb al-suhba*, ed. M.J. Kister, p. 28, notes 33 and 56 (reference to al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm ad-dīn*, vol. 2, p. 156, l. 1).

⁶⁷ See in detail Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* movement in early Sufism,” pp. 587–592.

⁶⁸ ‘Afifi (ed.), *Al-Malāmatīyya wal-sūfiyya wa-ahl al-futuwwa* (Cairo, 1945). ‘Afifi based his edition on two manuscripts: Berlin 3388 and Cairo, Dār al-kutub al-miṣriyya, Taṣawwuf section, 178. See his introduction, p. 83.

⁶⁹ Al-Fāwī, ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ, *Uṣūl al-Malāmatīyya wa-ghalāṭat al-Sūfiyya ta’līf al-Imām Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī* (Cairo, 1405/1985); on p. 102 of his introduction, al-Fāwī lists the existing manuscripts of al-Sulamī's *Risāla*. It seems that he has based his edition on the Cairo 178 MS in addition to MS Dār al-kutub al-miṣriyya no. 238 (*taṣawwuf Taymūr*). In his notes, al-Fāwī is concerned mainly with elaborating the themes under discussion; I could not find in them any references to variant or problematic readings.

وَحَمَّتْ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ حَمَدَ الْفَرَاءَ يَقُولُ: قَالَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ مَنَازِلِ حِينَ سُئِلَ عَنِ الْمَلَامِتِ فَقَالَ ...⁷⁰

In ‘Afifi's edition (p. 101) we find another saying reported by Ibn al-Farrā’: عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ مَنَازِلِ يَقُولُ وَقَدْ سُئِلَ مَلِكِ الْمَلَامِتِ هَرِئَ⁷¹ and that this is an error. But ‘Afifi does not clarify why he has chosen to amend the name in one place in his edited text and has left it unchanged in the other. In al-Fāwī's edition (p. 152) this saying is missing altogether.⁷²

Another example relates to the issue of *kash*, earning one's livelihood, or, more precisely, to the merit of tasting the humiliation involved in earning one's living. In al-Sulamī's *Tabaqāt*⁷³ the following saying is brought in the name of ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Muñāzil: لا خير في مكاسبه، فِيمَنْ لَا يَذُوقُ ذُلَّ الْكَاسِبِ, but in al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb al-luma‘*⁷⁴ it is attributed to ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak.⁷⁵ This saying, which al-Khargūshī, too, assigns to Ibn Muñāzil,⁷⁶ reflects the *malāmatī* attitude that encouraged adepts to work for their livelihood rather than to opt for *tawakkul*, a quietist reliance on God.⁷⁷ The attitude towards *kash* was one of the bones of contention between the Baghdādī and the Nīshāpūrī schools. Thus, in *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, al-Khargūshī has a chapter entitled بَابُ فِي الْكَسْبِ وَذِكْرُ الْاِخْتِلَافِ فِيهِ بَيْنَ اهْلِ الْعَرَاقِ وَاهْلِ خَرَاسَانِ which opens with the following statement: اخْتَلَفُوا فِي تَفْضِيلِ الْكَسْبِ عَلَى تَرْكِهِ، فَفَضَلَهُ اهْلُ خَرَاسَانِ وَاسْتَحْبَ اهْلُ الْعَرَاقِ تَرْكَهُ اعْلَمُ أَنْ مَكَاسِبِكَ لَا تَمْنَعُكَ مِنَ التَّفْوِيضِ فِي التَّوْكِلِ، إِذَا لَمْ تَضْبِعْ هَذِينِ الْأَمْرَيْنِ فِي كَسْبِكَ: النِّيَةُ وَالْإِحْلَاصُ⁷⁸ In *Kitāb al-luma‘*⁷⁹ this is reported in the name of Ibn al-Mubārak.⁷⁹ Here Ibn

⁷⁰ P. 144; there is no footnote to indicate a different reading, as would be expected from comparing this reading with ‘Afifi's version.

⁷¹ The comparison between the two editions raises many editorial and textual issues; a thorough scientific edition of this important text is, no doubt, called for.

⁷² Ed. Perdersen, p. 377.

⁷³ See *Kitāb al-Luma‘*, ed. Nicholson, p. 196: أَنَّهُ كَانَ: يَقُولُ: لَا خَيْرُ فِيمَنْ لَا يَذُوقُ ذُلَّ الْكَاسِبِ.

⁷⁴ MS Berlin f. 153b, ll. 1–2.

⁷⁵ Note the advice that Ḥamdūn al-Qassār gives to one of his disciples: “It is better for you to be known as ‘Abdallāh al-*hajjām* than as ‘Abdallāh the ‘ārif or as ‘Abdallāh the zāhid’ — al-Sulamī, *Risālat al-malāmatīyya*, ed. ‘Afifi, p. 94 (see also Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* movement,” 1993, pp. 603–4).

⁷⁶ Ed. Bārūd pp. 298–306 = MS Berlin ff. 153a–156b.

⁷⁷ Cf. also the following, *Tahdhīb*, f. 155b, ll. 12–14: الْأَفْضَلُ أَنْ يَؤْثِرَ التَّوْكِلَ عَلَى الْكَسْبِ فَيَنْتَهِ الْكَسْبُ وَيَتَوَكَّلُ عَلَى اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ الْمَسَاجِدُ الَّتِي هِي بَيْتُ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

⁷⁸ Bārūd reads here: تَصْنَعُ.

⁷⁹ See al-Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-Luma‘*, ed. Nicholson, p. 196: مَكَاسِبِكَ لَا تَمْنَعُكَ مِنَ التَّفْوِيضِ وَالتَّوْكِلِ إِذَا لَمْ تَضْبِعْهَا فِي كَسْبِهِ.

Munāzil reflects the view, so typical of the *malāmatī* teaching, and in particular of the teaching of his direct master Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār, that, on his spiritual journey, the adept should maintain a normative appearance while keeping constant watch over his inner being. Thus, in *Risālat al-Malāmatiyya*, al-Sulamī states plainly: **وَأَحَبُّوا [مِشَايِخَ الْمَلَامِتِيَّةِ] إِلَيْهِم مَلَازِمَ الْأَسْوَاقِ بِالْأَبْدَانِ وَالْفَرَارِ مِنْهَا بِالْقُلُوبِ**.⁸⁰ In the *Tabaqāt al-Ṣūfiyya* al-Sulamī reports a dictum by Ḥamdūn, transmitted by the latter's disciple, 'Abdallāh b. Munāzil: "When a man stops pursuing a livelihood, he becomes a pestering beggar" (عود الرء عن). In the *Tahdhīb*, al-Khargūshī reports the same piece of teaching thus: **وَحَكَى عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ مَنْازِلٍ عَنْ أَسْتَاذِهِ أَبِي حَمْلَجَ قَالَ: إِنَّ الْكَسْبَ إِلَّا حَافَ فِي الْمَسَأَةِ**.⁸¹ Abū Ṣalīḥ, as we know, is the *kunya* of Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār. Thus, the Nīshāpūri authors, although their literary tradition, too, has suffered from the hands of careless or unsure scribes (see above, p. 465), clearly mirror the special association of Ibn Munāzil with Ḥamdūn and his teaching. On the other hand, in *Kitāb al-luma'*, whose author, Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj, is mainly concerned with the Baghdādī circles of Ṣūfis, the confusion of Munāzil with Mubārak is much more extensive; it is possible that this confusion originated with al-Sarrāj himself.

It is therefore obvious, I believe, that in the pursuit to identify Ibn Munāzil, to distinguish him from Ibn al-Mubārak, and to trace his affiliation with the Nīshāpūri teachers, we are not only rectifying a pervasive graphic error, but also illuminating the special traits and relationships that define the mystical movement of Nīshāpūr in the 9th–10th centuries. Such clarifications are important also in order to grasp better the rapports and exchanges among the mystics of Nīshāpūr and Baghdad, and the "to-ing and fro-ing" that took place among them during the formative period of Islamic mysticism.

D. Ibn Munāzil and al-Shiblī

The inquiry that I am attempting here was sparked off by a fairly long anecdote which I encountered in *Tahdhīb al-asrār*. In it, Abū Bakr al-Shiblī, a renowned Ṣūfi of the Baghdādī school, instructs Ibn Munāzil about the correct way to perform the pilgrimage. Having argued in favour of the Nīshāpūri-*malāmatī* affiliation of Ibn Munāzil, especially via Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār, my theory seems to be shaken by an account that

shows Ibn Munāzil as a disciple of al-Shiblī. The question of who exactly was Ibn Munāzil and what was the full range of his affiliations thus becomes even more intriguing. Equally intriguing is the meaning of al-Shiblī's teaching conveyed to Ibn Munāzil *vis-à-vis* the latter's distinctly introverted mystical way (see above). Here is a précis of the pilgrimage story according to *Tahdhīb al-asrār* (the Arabic text follows in section F).

Having resolved to perform a pilgrimage, Ibn Munāzil comes to al-Shiblī to announce this decision. Al-Shiblī hands him two bags and instructs him that upon arrival at Mecca he should fill them with mercy (*rahma*) and bring them back with him [to Baghdad], so that all the companions may have a share in it and may live by it for a while. Ibn Munāzil, the narrator, fulfills the obligations of the *hajj*, the *'umra*, and the *ziyāra*, and returns to al-Shiblī. Al-Shiblī then questions him as to how he performed the various rituals of the *hajj*. Ibn Munāzil recounts them one by one. Obviously, as far as religious law is concerned, he has fulfilled his duties to the letter. But following the account of each of the rituals, al-Shiblī stops Ibn Munāzil and asks him whether he performed them also on a deeper, contemplative level, and whether he has thus attained through them mystical states and visions. Each time the question is raised, Ibn Munāzil answers in the negative. He has simply performed his religious duties, no more and no less. In this case, declares al-Shiblī, you have not performed the *hajj* at all. You should go back and repeat it all over again.

Leaving aside the interesting didactic and thematic questions that this account raises, I have asked myself what to make of the association, made obvious by the text, between Ibn Munāzil and al-Shiblī. I could find no parallel to this story in other compilations or in the biographical literature. No other work of al-Sulamī or, for that matter, no other work that I could consult, mentions such a meeting or refers to such a relationship. Were the information concerning Ibn Munāzil's association with al-Shiblī based on firm ground, I venture to argue, al-Sulamī would surely have mentioned it in the *Tabaqāt*. In the *Kitāb al-luma'*, Ibn Munāzil is not mentioned at all, except in the guise of Ibn al-Mubārak (see above, note 73). But, since al-Sarrāj is mainly concerned with the Baghdādī circle of al-Junayd, the lack of evidence here only strengthens the argument for Ibn Munāzil as an adherent of the Nīshāpūri circles. Naturally, with today's database facilities, a careful electronic search may yield some intriguing results. But thus far they have not materialized. What I did come up with, however, may point in several meaningful directions.

⁸⁰ Ed. 'Affīfī, p. 101.

⁸¹ MS Berlin, f. 153a, ll. 16–17.

E. Nīshāpūrīs in Baghdad

Delving into the biographical and hagiographical literature brings up interesting correlations. Thus, in *Nafahāt al-uns*, Jāmī reports that al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Azdi, Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī's father (died ca. 340/951–2), was a disciple of both ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil and Abū ‘Alī Thaqafī and that he also met al-Shiblī.⁸² These comments shed light on the complex affiliations connecting and dividing the Nīshāpūrīs. It also alludes to the possible connection of some of them with al-Shiblī. It seems that those who became attached to al-Shiblī were mainly the followers of ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil, namely, adherents of the path of Ḥamdūn al-Qaṣṣār. If this is so, then it also appears that Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī, rather than following the path of his father, chose to follow that of his maternal grandfather, Abū ‘Amr Ismā‘il b. Nujayd, who was a close adherent of the Abū ‘Uthmān al-Hīrī's and Abū Ḥafs al-Haddād's path. Incidentally, al-Sulamī even adopted his maternal grandfather's *nisba* rather than his father's.⁸³ May we surmise here a discipleship divide within al-Sulamī's own family?⁸⁴ Should we not consider the possibility that echoes of this segmentation reverberate, as a subtext, throughout the seemingly innocuous surface of pious anecdotes and sayings gathered in the classical compilations?

Another case pointing in a similar direction is that of Abū Sahl Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Šu‘lukī (d. 369/979–80),⁸⁵ an important Nīshāpūrī and a prominent Shāfi‘ī scholar.⁸⁶ Al-Sam‘ānī, as well as al-Khargūshī, name him *imām ‘asrihi*.⁸⁷ Al-Sam‘ānī tells us that al-Šu‘lukī studied *fiqh* with Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī (on whose connection with Ibn Munāzil and with al-Shiblī, see above). Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī tells us that he was among al-Khargūshī's teachers,⁸⁸ and we have seen that, in fact, it was he who gave al-Sulamī the *ijāza* to teach novices.⁸⁹ Jāmī, in his *Nafahāt al-uns*, informs us that al-Šu‘lukī followed al-Shiblī, al-Murta‘ish and, again, Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī.⁹⁰ Now, it is curious that,

⁸² Vol. 1, p. 444 (no. 375).

⁸³ See al-Sam‘ānī, *al-Ansāb*, vol. 3, p. 279.

⁸⁴ For the two Nīshāpūrī schools, see Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the early *malāmatī* movement,” pp. 596–599.

⁸⁵ See al-Sam‘ānī, *al-Ansāb* (Beirut, 1408/1988), vol. 3, pp. 539ff — note that the *nisba* al-Hanaff reflects his tribal origins rather than his legal affiliation.

⁸⁶ See ‘Abd al-Rahman's dissertation: *A critical edition of Kitāb Sharaf al-Muṣṭafā by Abū Sa‘d al-Kharkūshī* (Exeter University, 1986), pp. 18, 20.

⁸⁷ See Sam‘ānī, *ibid.*; al-Khargūshī, *Tahdhīb* (1999), pp. 36, 156.

⁸⁸ Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh Baghdaḍ*, vol. 10, p. 431, no. 5594.

⁸⁹ See above, note 3.

⁹⁰ Jāmī, *Nafahāt al-uns*, vol. 1, pp. 444–45 (no. 376).

in spite of the great esteem with which Abū Sahl al-Šu‘lukī was held, and in spite of al-Sulamī's own dues to him, al-Sulamī does not dedicate an entry in the *Tabaqāt* to him. He mentions him only twice in his hagiographical *Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, in both cases as a direct informant. In the first instance he is al-Sulamī's source for information concerning al-Shiblī (p. 348), and in the second for information concerning al-Murta‘ish (p. 359). The latter is another intriguing name that seems to play a role in the Nīshāpūrī-Baghdādī complex. Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Murta‘ish (d. 328/939–40) came from Nīshāpūr. He was, we are told, a son of a *dihqān*⁹¹ and used to live in the Nīshāpūrī quarter of al-Hīra. He had studied with Abū Ḥafs and Abū ‘Uthmān but later, presumably after the death of the latter,⁹² he moved to Baghdad where he became a follower of al-Junayd. Eventually he became one of the great Baghdaḍī masters.⁹³ May we consider al-Murta‘ish as another link between Ibn Munāzil and al-Shiblī? This is a speculation. What is obvious, however, is that when we link up the names of the Nīshāpūrīs who had left their hometown for Baghdad, connections with al-Shiblī emerge: Abū ‘Alī al-Thaqafī, Abū Sahl al-Šu‘lukī, al-Murta‘ish, and al-Sulamī's father used to be followers of Ḥamdūn and Ibn Munāzil in Nīshāpūr, and eventually moved to Baghdad where they became associated with al-Shiblī. Historically, it is also obvious that, as we approach the generation of al-Khargūshī and al-Sulamī, the geographic and social horizons of Nīshāpūrī mysticism widen. Al-Junayd may already be dead, but in Baghdad al-Shiblī is still going strong.

With al-Khargūshī and al-Sulamī, and somewhat later with al-Qushayrī, Nīshāpūrī mysticism enters into the arena of Sūfism, and a new phase in the history of Islamic mysticism commences. It is, perhaps, the conciliatory, homogenizing aura of this new phase that transpires from the encounter between al-Shiblī and Ibn Munāzil: It was good and well for Nīshāpūrīs of former *malāmatī* groups to aspire to hide their mystical attainments *from their fellowmen as well as from their own selves* behind the façade of normative, orthodox behavior.⁹⁴ The time has come, however, for a new line of teaching and a new code of

⁹¹ See *Adab al-mulūk*, Radtke (ed.), p. 42, l. 2.

⁹² For the movement of disciples after the demise of their teachers, see Sviri, *op. cit.* p. 599.

⁹³ See al-Sulamī, *Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, ed. Perdersen, p. 356: *وأقام ببغداد حتى مبار* ... *أحد مشايخ العراق وأئمهم حتى ... كان مشارع العراق يقولون: عجائب بغداد في التصوف ثلاث:* *أيضاً إشارات الشليل ونكت المترشح وحكايات حضر الخلي* ... *see also al-Qushayrī, al-Risāla*, p. 26; *al-Sam‘ānī, al-Ansāb*, vol. 5, p. 253; *al-Qazwīnī, Āthār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-ībād*, p. 401.

⁹⁴ For the *malāmatīs'* wish to block their consciousness from the awareness of their own mystical experiences, see Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the early *malāmatī* movement,” p. 609.

behavior, according to which the mystical attainments of the devotional life be made seen by others as well as be made conscious to their bearer.

F. The text

الخرگوشي، تهذيب الأسرار، مخ برلين، 120 أ، س 2 - 121 ب، س 5
= ب - تحقيق بسام محمد بارود، أبو ظبي 1999 ، ص 242-244 (يعتمد المحقق على مخطوطة دار الكتب الوطنية في الجمع الثقافي في أبو ظبي وهي نسخة تم نسخها في ربيع الأول 608⁹⁵)

في ذكر الحج والعمرة⁹⁶

(120a) (242) وعن عبدالله بن منازل قال: اردت الحج فدخلت على أبي بكر الشبلي فأخبرته بالعزم فقال لي: قف، فقال لغلامه: هات (120b) غرارتين⁹⁷ وقال لي: خذهما معك فإذا وصلت إلى مكة فاملاهما رحمة وجىء بهما معك لتكون حظنا من الحج ونفرقها⁹⁸ على من حضرنا ونجى بها وقتا.
قال: ففرحت من عنده إلى الحج فلما رجعت دخلت عليه فقال لي: حجت؟ فقلت: ¹⁰⁰نعم، قال: جئت الميقات؟ ¹⁰¹قلت: نعم، قال: ايش عملت؟ قلت: اغتنست وأحرمت وصلبت ركتين وليبيت.
قال: عقدت الحج؟ قلت: نعم، قال: فساخت بعقدك كل ¹⁰²عقد عقدته يخالف هذا العقد ويضاده منذ خلقت؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما عقدت.
قال: نزعت ثيابك؟ قلت: نعم، قال: تجردت من كل شيء؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما

راجع مقدمة المحقق، ص 17؛ لم أجد نسخة مقارنة لهذه الحكاية عن تعلم الشبلي لعبد الله⁹⁵ بن منازل الحج المختichi في آية من المجموعات الصوفية المعروفة ولم أتحقق أي علاقة كانت بين عبدالله بن منازل (النيسابوري اللامتي) والشبلي (البغدادي)؛ للمعنى التهذبي المثال لهذه الحكاية، قارن ما يوجد في كتاب اللمع لابن نصر السراج؟ باب ذكر أذاهم في الحج، تحقيق نيكلسون ١٩١٤، ص ١٢٣-١٢٢؛ عن أبي محمد عبدالله ابن محمد بن منازل - انظر أسلمي، طبقات الصوفية، تحقيق بدرسون، ٣٨٣-٣٨٠.

⁹⁶ For the whole topic, cf. in detail, al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi, *Kitab al-hajj wa-asrarahu* (Cairo, 1969).

ب: غراتين.

ب: وجىء.

ب: وتفرقها.

ب: قلت.

ب: الميقات.

ب: على.

نزعت.
قال: تطهرت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: زال عنك كل علة لتطهرك؟¹⁰³ قلت: لا، قال:

ما تطهرت.
قال: لبست؟ قلت: نعم، قال: وجدت جواب التلبية بتلبية مثلها؟ قلت: لا،
قال: ما لبست.¹⁰⁴

قال: دخلت الحرم؟ قلت: نعم، قال: اعتدت بدخولك الحرم ترك كل محرام؟
قلت: لا، قال: ما دخلت الحرم.

قال: اشرفت على مكة؟ قلت: نعم، قال: اشرفت عليك حال من الحق باشرافك
على مكة؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما اشرفت على مكة.

قال: دخلت المسجد؟ قلت: نعم، قال: دخلت في قربه من حيث علمت؟
قلت: لا، قال: ما دخلت (243) المسجد.

قال: رأيت الكعبة؟ قلت: نعم، قال: رأيت من قصده؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما
رأيت الكعبة.

قال: رملت ثلاثاً ومشيت أربعاء؟¹⁰⁵ قلت: نعم، قال: هربت من الدنيا هربا
علمت أنك قد فاصلتها وانقطعت عنها ووجدت بشيك الأربع أماناً مما هربت
منه؟ قلت: لا، قال: (121a) ما رملت وما¹⁰⁶ مشيت.

قال: طفت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: لذت بالله تعالى شakra لذلك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما
طفت.

قال: صافت الحجر الأسود؟ قلت: نعم، قال فصعق صعقه وقال: ويلك، قد
قيل إن من صلغ الحجر¹⁰⁷ فقد صلغ الحق، ثم قال: وفيت بالعهد لمن¹⁰⁸ بايته؟
قلت: لا، قال: ما صافت الحجر.¹⁰⁹

ب: بتطهرك

قارن ابن عساكر، تاريخ دمشق، ج ٣٢، ص ٩٢: حدثنا أبو الحسن الإسلامي الفقيه ← عبد العزيز بن أحمد ← عبد الوهاب بن جعفر الياباني ← أبو سعد عبد الملك بن أبي عثمان الوعاطي [الخرگوشي]... ← عطاء قال: «بلغنا أن موسى بن عمران صلى الله عليه وسلم [هكذا] طاف بين الصفا والمروة وعليه جهة قطوانية وهو يقول: ليك الله ليك فيجيئ ربه: ليك يا موسى» للرمل في الحج، انظر المقدسي عبدالله بن قدامة، الكافي في فقه ابن حنبل، بيروت، المكتب الاسلامي، ١٤٠٨ - ١٩٨٨، تحقيق زهير الشاويش، ج ١ س ٤٣٨: «ويحسن أن يرقى على الصفا والمروة ويرمل بين العلمين ويعتني ما سوى ذلك لأن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فعله ولا يجب»؛ انظر أيضاً مجموعات الحديث في أبواب الحج.

ب: ولا

ب: + الأسود

ب: لما

قارن الفرازلي، أحياء علوم الدين، كتاب أسرار الحج، بيان الاعمال الباطنة: «واما الإسلام فاعتذر عنده انك مبایع لله عز وجل على طاعته فصم عزیتك على الوفاء بییمتک، فعن غدر في المایة استحق المقت، وقد روی ابن عباس رضى الله عنه عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم انه قال: «الحجر الأسود حين الله عز وجل في الأرض يصافح بها خلقه كما يصافح الرجل أهله».

قال: وقفت الوقفة بين يدي الله عز وجل خلف المقام وصلت ركعتين؟ قلت: نعم، قال: أوقفت على مكانك وحالك وكوشت بأسرارك وأمنت¹¹⁰ في مقامك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما صلحت.

قال: خرحت إلى الصفا¹¹¹ فرققت عليه؟ قلت: نعم، قال: أيش عملت - كبرت؟ قلت: نعم، كبرت سبعاً وسالت الله تعالى من خير الدنيا والآخرة وذرت الحج وسألته القبول، قال: كبرت حين وجدت الملكة تصغر فيما أمرت حتى وجدت حقيقة ذكرك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما صعدت الصفا.¹¹²

قال: نزلت من الصفا؟ قلت: نعم، قال: زالت عنك كل علة حتى صفيت؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما نزلت من الصفا.

قال: هرولت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: فررت منك إليه فتبرأت من فرارك ووصلت إلى مطلوبك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما هرولت.

قال: وصلت إلى الروءة؟ قلت: نعم، قال: رأيت السكينة على الروءة فأخذتها وزرلت عليك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما صعدت الصفا¹¹³ ولا الروءة.

قال: خرحت إلى متى؟ قلت: نعم، قال: وجدت مناك مما أملته¹¹⁴ من مأمولك فأعطيت؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما دخلت منها.

قال: دخلت مسجد الخيف؟^{121b} قلت: نعم، قال: خفت الله عز وجل في دخولك وخروجك حتى¹¹⁵ وجدت من الخوف ما لم تجده إلا فيه؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما دخلت مسجد الخيف.

قال: مضيت إلى عرفات؟ قلت: نعم، قال: وقفت بها¹¹⁶ قلت: نعم، قال: عرفت الحال التي خلقت من أجلها والحال التي تصير إليها وما ينزل على أهل عرفة وما يتتحققون به وعرفت المعرف لك¹¹⁷ هذه الأحوال ورأيت المكان الذي إليه الإشارات فإنه هو الذي نفس الأنفاس في كل حال؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما وقفت بعرفات.

قال: نفرت إلى المزدلفة؟ قلت: نعم، قال: رأيت الشعر الحرام؟ قلت: نعم، قال: ذكرت الله تعالى ذكرًا أنساك ذكر ما سواه؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما وقفت بالمزدلفة.

¹¹⁰ برلين: يجوز أن تكون القراءة الصحيحة وانت في مقامك.

¹¹¹ برلين: صفاء.

¹¹² برلين: صعد الصفاء.

¹¹³ برلين: صفاء.

¹¹⁴ بـ: وجدت ما أملته

¹¹⁵ برلين: حتى منسوخة.

¹¹⁶ بـ: «قال وقفت بها» ناقص.

¹¹⁷ بـ: له.

قارن، كتاب اللمع ، ص ١٧٣: «فإذا ذبحوا فادهم في الذبح أن يبدأوا بذبح نفوسهم قبل ذبح ذيعيتهم»؛ قارن أيضًا تهذيب الأسرار ، ص ٢٤٦: «ثم رأيتها رفع رأسه إلى السماء وقال: إن هؤلاء تربوا إليك بقرباناتهم وانا لا أبعد قربانا غير نفسي ولاني أقرب إليك بذبح نفسي

قال: ذبحت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: نفسك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما ذبحت.¹¹⁸

قال: رميت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: جهلك عنك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما رميت.

قال: حلقت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: نقضت آمالك عنك؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما حلقت.

قال: زرت؟ قلت: نعم، قال: كشف لك عنك زرته؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما زرت.

قال: حللت عنده؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما حججت ولا زرت وعليك العودة.¹¹⁹

Vis-à-vis this story, which harmonizes the ritualistic-external observance of the *shari'a* with a rigorous adherence to its inner meanings and manifestations, note the following saying by Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl (a 9th-century mystic from Balkh and Samarqand who corresponded with both Abū 'Uthmān of the Nīshāpūri school and with al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī):

وقال محمد بن الفضل: عجبت لمن قطع البوادي والملاوز حتى يصل إلى بيته وحرمه لأن فيه آثار أنبياءه وأولياءه كيف لا يقطع نفسه وهواده حتى يصل إلى قلبه لأن فيه آثار مولاه. قالوا: فانشققت مرارة أربعة من سمعوا هذا الكلام فماتوا. تهذيب الأسرار ، ١٩٩٩، ص ١٢٦ باب خلافة الموى .

Note also the following saying attributed to al-Shiblī, in al-Kharğūšī's *Tahdīb al-asrār*, p. 237 (باب في ذكر الصلاة):

وعن الشبلī قال: القبة ثلاثة: فقبلة العام الكعبة، وقبلة الخاص العرش وهو قبلة الملائكة، وقبلة العارفين قلوبهم ينظرون بنور قلوبهم إلى ربهم عز وجل.

G. Conclusions

The study presented here surveys texts and sources that highlight a transitional point in the history of Islamic mysticism. This transition entails the eventual inclusion of the mystical school of Nīshāpūr within the mystical school of Baghdad during the 4th/10th century, and after the death of some central masters. This inclusion heralded the appearance of the literary genre known as Ṣūfi compilations, which portrays, on the whole, a picture of Ṣūfism as an all-inclusive Islamic mystical system. At the same time, these compilations also contain prooftexts that allow us to trace local differences and affiliations. The study was inspired by two

فتيل مني-

¹¹⁸ كتاب أسرار الحج: بيان الأعمال الباطنة ووجه الإخلاص في النية - التذكر لأسرارها - من أول: الحج إلى آخر

little-known entities: al-Khargūshī's Sūfi compilation *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, and the figure of Ibn Munāzil, one of the Nīshāpūri mystics who ended up gravitating, along with other Nīshāpūris, towards the teachings of Baghdādī mystics. One of the questions that the study deals with is the Shī'ī presence in Nīshāpūr and the possibility that Nīshāpūr was the birth-place of ideas and practices which were later separately introduced into both Shī'ism and Sūfism.

It is my contention that this study and its conclusions bring to the fore an important methodological question: how should the formative period of Islamic mysticism and the literature that it produced be studied? How to read Sūfi texts within a wide historical and sociological perspective? Such questions have been asked concerning the study of *hadīth*, early Shī'ism, the emergence of the theological schools, and the formation of the legal *madhāhib*, yet its employment for the study of Sūfism has so far been limited. It has become evident that Sūfism is no monolithic mystical stream within Islam, and that its divergences did not start with the emergence of the Sūfi *turuq* in the 12th–13th centuries; neither is it a set of phenomena isolated from other Islamic religious and social phenomena. I hope therefore that this enquiry will contribute to a shift in the perspective from which the study of early Islamic mysticism is viewed and will encourage further research of the formative period of Sūfism from the standpoint of "How to Read a Sūfi Text?" If nothing else, I hope it will attract scholarly attention to al-Khargūshī's compilation.

Appendix: The Abū Dhabī Edition of *Tahdhīb al-asrār*: Preliminary Observations

According to the editor, Bassām Muḥammad Bārūd, his edition of the *Tahdhīb al-asrār* is based on manuscript خ 1163 found at The National Library of the Cultural Academy of Abū Dhabi (= Dār al-Kutub al-Waṭāniyya fī al-Majma‘ al-Thaqāfi fī Abū Dhabi). According to the colophon, the copying was completed in Rabi‘ al-awwal 680 AH [= September 1211 CE]. It is thus much earlier than the Berlin MS, which, according to Ahlwardt's description, is dated as 848/1444. The editor acknowledges the existence of this later copied Berlin manuscript, but did not consult it.¹²⁰ In the context of this study, I have not carried out a systematic comparison of the published edition with the Berlin MS,

¹²⁰ Al-Kharkūshī, *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, ed. Bassām Muḥammad Bārūd (Abū Dhabi, 1999), pp. 17–18.

although occasional checks indicate that such a comparison is called for. For example, Arberry correctly points out that MS Berlin, ff. 10b–11a, includes a saying attributed to the Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī. The latter died in 1166; hence, evidently, the original text of al-Khargūshī must have been tampered with. Indeed, Bārūd's edition (pp. 36–37) has no trace of such an obvious interpolation.¹²¹ At the same time, it would be wrong to assume that Bārūd's edition is based on the better of the two manuscripts. The superiority of the Berlin MS can be seen, for example, in the following case: when Shibli instructs ‘Abdallāh b. Munāzil what the true meanings of the ritualistic stages of *hajj* are, he asks his interlocutor about his experience at Mina:

قال: خرجت الى منا؟ قلت: نعم، قال: وجدت مُناك مما املته¹²² من مأولك فاعطيت؟ قلت: لا، قال: ما دخلت منا.

Here it is obvious that the Abū Dhabī manuscript which reads: وجدت مُناك falls short, as it has lost the word (= the things you wish for) upon whose etymological-symbolic, and even graphic, association with Mina the sense of al-Shiblī's comment hangs.

The following is an example of the help that can be derived from MS Berlin in filling textual *lacunae*: on p. 24, ll. 2–3 of the printed edition, the editor was unable to fully decipher the text because of a blot in the manuscript. However, f. 4a of the Berlin MS reveals the illegible word or words and thus allows for a plausible reading.

It goes without saying that without a thorough examination of the Berlin MS *vis-à-vis* Bārūd's edition, and without consulting the other existing MSS,¹²³ it would be impossible to establish a textual "history" and manuscript affiliations, and, in some cases, to arrive at the correct reading of al-Khargūshī's original text. Due to the above, the scholarly edition of *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, which is being prepared by Naṣrallāh Pourjavady, is eagerly awaited.

¹²¹ It should be noted that in the margin of MS Berlin f. 11a, a hand that is similar, possibly identical, to the hand of the scribe, has written: وهذه زيادة ما كانت في نسخته [الشيخ أبي سعد المؤذن]

¹²² بـ: وجدت مـا أـملـته.

¹²³ According to Sezgin, 670, there exist two more manuscripts of the *Tahdhīb al-asrār*: Şehid ‘Alī 1157 (this MS was consulted by Nwyia, see *Exégèse*, p. 34, note 128) and Feyz 280 (292ff, 863 H); the latter was copied in the same year as Şehid ‘Alī 1157.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 'Abd al-Rahman, Dawood Sulayman. *A critical edition of Kitāb sharaf al-Muṣṭafā by Abū Sa'īd... al-Kharkūshī*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Exeter, 1986.
- 'Afīfī, Abū 'Alā'. *Al-Malāmatiyya wa-'l-ṣūfiyya wa-ahl al-futuwwa*. Cairo, 'Isā al-Bābī al-Halabī, 1945.
- Āgā Buzurg-i Ṭihrānī. *Tabaqāt a'lām al-Shī'a*. Beirut, 1390/1971.
- Ahlwardt, W. *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Dritter Band. Berlin, 1891.
- Anonymous. *Adab al-mulūk fī bayān ḥaqā'iq al-taṣawwuf*. B. Radtke, ed. Beirut, 1991.
- Arberry, A.J. "Did Sulamī plagiarize Sarrāj?" *JRAS* (1937): 461–465.
- . "Khargūshī's manual of Sūfism." *BSOAS* 9 (1937–39): 345–349.
- 'Attār, Farīd al-Dīn. *Tadhkīrat al-awliyā'*. R.A. Nicholson, ed. London and Leiden, 1907.
- Al-Bayhaqī, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī al-shāhīr bi-Ibn Funduq. *Lubāb al-ansāb wa-'l-alqāb wal-a'qāb*. M. al-Rajā'ī, ed. Qumm, 1410.
- Bosworth, C.E. *The Ghaznavids. Their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 994–1040*. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Böwering, G. *The mystical vision of existence in classical Islam. The Qur'ānic hermeneutics of the Sūfi Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896)*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- . "Sūfi hermeneutics in medieval Islam." *Revue des études islamiques* 55–57 (1987–89): 255–270.
- . "The major sources of Sulamī's minor Qur'ān commentary." *Oriens* 35 (1996): 35–56.
- Bulliet, R.W. *The patricians of Nīshāpūr, a study in medieval Islamic social history*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Chittick, W. *Sufism. A short introduction*. Oxford, Oneworld, 2000.

- Colby, F.S. "The subtleties of the Ascension: al-Sulamī on the Mi'rāj of the Prophet Muḥammad." *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002): 167–183.
- Corbin, H. *En Islam iranien. Aspects spirituels et philosophiques*. vol. IV. Paris, 1972.
- Al-Fāwī, 'Abd al-Fattāḥ. *Uṣūl al-Malāmatiyya wa-ghalāṭat al-Ṣūfiyya ta'lis al-Imām Abī 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī*. Cairo, 1405/1985.
- Frye, R. *The Histories of Nīshāpūr*. Harvard Oriental Series No. 45. The Hague, 1965.
- Ghāzalī, Abū Ḥāmid. *Iḥyā 'ulūm ad-dīn*. various editions.
- Goldschmidt, E.P. *Mediaeval texts and their first appearance in print*. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 1943.
- Gramlich, R. (ed. and trans.). *Das Sendschreiben al-Quṣayrīs über das Sufitum*. Wiesbaden, 1989.
- Al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī. *Kitāb al-hajj wa-asrārihi*. Cairo, 1969.
- Halm, H. *Die islamische Gnosis. Die extreme Schia und die 'Alawiten*. Zürich-Munich, 1982.
- . *Shiism* (translated from the German by Janet Watson). Edinburgh University Press, c1991.
- Ibn Qūlawayhi al-Qummī (d. 368). *Kāmil al-ziyārāt*. Qumm, Nashr al-faqāha, n.d.
- al-Isfahānī, Abū al-Faraj. *Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn*. Ahmād Ṣaqr, ed. Cairo, 1368/1949.
- Jāmī, 'Abd al-Rahmān. *Nafahāt al-uns min ḥadarāt al-quds*. Tehran, 1337sh; (also the 1042/1632–3 Arabic translation by Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Qurashī). Beirut, 1424/2003.
- Karīmī = see al-Khalifa al-Naysābūrī.
- Al-Khalifa al-Naysābūrī, Ahmād b. Muḥammad. *Talkhīs Ta'rīkh Nay-sābūr*. Bahmān Karīmī, ed. Tehran, 1337sh.
- Al-Khargūshī. *Tahdhīb al-asrār*. MS Berlin: Ahlwardt 2819 (originally Sprenger 832); Bassām Muḥammad Bārūd, ed. Abū Dhābi, 1999.
- Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. *Ta'rīkh Baghdaḍ*. Beirut, 1997.
- Levī, A. *Islamic Mysticism*. Leiden, 2000.

- Kraus, P. *Jābir b. Hayyān. Contribution à l'histoire des idées scientifiques dans l'Islam.* Cairo, 1942–43) (2 vols.).
- Mahjub, Muhammad Ja'far. "Chivalry and early Persian Sufism." In L. Lewisohn, ed. *Classical Persian Sufism from its origins to Rūmī.* 1993, pp. 549–581.
- Massignon, L. *Essay on the origins of the technical language of Islamic mysticism.* (English translation by Benjamin Clark). Notre Dame, Indiana, 1997.
- . "La 'Futuwwa' ou 'Paete d'honneur artisanal' entre les travailleurs musulmans au Moyen Age." In *Opera Minora*, Paris, 1969, vol. 1, pp. 396–421.
- . *The passion of al-Hallāj: mystic and martyr of Islam.* H. Mason, trans. Princeton, N.J., 1982 (in 4 vols.).
- . "Die Ursprünge und die Bedeutung des Gnostizismus im Islam." In *Opera Minora*, Paris, 1969, vol. 1, pp. 499–513.
- Al-Mas'ūdī. *Murūj al-dhahab.* B. de Meynard, ed. Paris, 1861–1877 (9 vols.).
- Al-Mas'ūdī. *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādin al-jawhar.* Ch. Pellat, ed. Beirut, 1965–1979 (7 vols.).
- Meier, F. "Ein wichtiger Handschriftenfund zur Sufik." *Oriens* 20 (1967): 60–106.
- . "Khurāsān and the end of classical Sufism." English translation in *Essays on Islamic piety and mysticism.* 1999, pp. 189–219. (originally in German, in *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema La Persia nel Medioevo.* Rome 1971, pp. 545–70).
- Mojaddedi, Jawid A. *The biographical tradition in Sufism. The ṭabaqāt genre from al-Sulamī to Jāmī.* Curzon, Richmond, 2001.
- al-Nawbakhtī, al-Hasan b. Mūsā. *Firaq al-Shī'a.* Muḥammad Ṣādiq, ed. Najaf, 1959.
- Newman, A. J. *The formative period of Twelver Shiism.* Curzon, Richmond, 2000.
- Nwyia, P. *Exégèse coranique et langage mystique.* Beirut, 1970.
- . "Le *Tafsīr* mystique attribué à Ḥaḍar Ṣādiq." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph,* 43 (1967): 181–230.

- . *Trois œuvres inédites de mystiques musulmans.* Beirut, 1986 (1973).
- Pourjavady, N. "Manba'i kohan dar bāb-e malāmatiyān-e Nīshāpūr." *Ma'ārif* 15 (1998/1377): 3–50.
- Al-Qazwīnī. *Āthār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-'ibād.* Beirut, Dār Ṣādir wa-Dār Bayrūt, 1960/1380.
- al-Qushayrī, Abū 'l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Karīm. *Al-Risāla fī 'ilm al-taṣawwuf.* Cairo, n.d.
- Radtke, B. "Theologen und Mystiker in Hurāsān und Transoxania." *ZDMG* 136 (1986): 536–569.
- . "Taṣawwuf" in *EI²* (updating L. Massignon's article in the 1st edition of the *EI*).
- Rubin, U. *Muhammad the Prophet in the early literature of ḥadīth.* Doctoral dissertation, Tel-Aviv University, 1976.
- Al-Sam'ānī. *al-Ansāb.* Al-Bārūdī, ed. Beirut, 1408/1988 (5 vols.).
- Al-Sarīfīnī, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (d. 641/1243) "Muntakhab min K. al-siyāq li-ta'rīkh Naysābūr." In Richard Frye. *The Histories of Nīshāpūr.* Harvard Oriental Series No. 45. The Hague, 1965.
- Al-Sarrāj, Abū Nasr. *Kitāb al-luma' fī al-taṣawwuf.* R.A. Nicholson, ed. Leiden, 1914.
- Schimmel, A. *Mystical dimensions of Islam.* Chapel Hill, 1975.
- Sezgin, F. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (= GAS). Leiden, 1967, vol. 1.
- Shaybī, Kāmil Mustafā. *al-Sila bayna al-taṣawwuf wal-tashayyu'.* Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1982. 3rd edition.
- Al-Shaykh al-Mufid. *Kitāb al-Irshād. The Book of Guidance into the Lives of the Twelve Imams.* I.K.A. Howard, Eng. trans. Horsham, Balāgha Books, 1981.
- Al-Subkī, 'Abd al-Wahhāb. *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'iyya al-kubrā.* Cairo, 1383/1964 (10 vols.).
- al-Sulamī, Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān. *Ādāb al-suḥba wa-ḥusn al-'ishra.* M.J. Kister, ed. Jerusalem, 1954.

- . *Jawāmi‘ ādāb al-ṣūfiyya wa-‘uyūb al-nafs wa-mudāwātuḥā*. E. Kohlberg, ed. Jerusalem, 1976.
- . *Kitāb al-Futuwwa*. Sulaymān Ātesh, ed. 1977 (in Pourjavady (ed.). *Majmū‘a-ye āthār*, vol. 2, pp. 219–333)
- . *Majmū‘a-ye āthār-e Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Sulamī*. Naṣrallāh Pourjavady, ed. Tehran, 1369sh–1372sh (2 vols.).
- . *Risālat al-malāmatiyya*. Abū ‘Alā’ ‘Afifi, ed. *Al-Malāmatiyya wa-‘l-ṣūfiyya wa-ahl al-futuwwa*. Cairo, Ḫāfiẓ al-Bābī al-Halabī, 1945 and ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Fāwī, *Uṣūl al-Malāmatiyya wa-ghalatāt al-Ṣūfiyya ta’līf al-Imām Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī*. Cairo, 1405/1985.
- . *Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*. N. Shurayba, ed. Cairo, 1953; J. Pedersen, ed. Leiden, 1960.
- . *Tis‘a kutub fī usūl al-taṣawwuf wa-‘l-zuhd li-Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī*. S.I. Ātesh, ed. Beirut, 1993.
- Sviri, S. “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* movement in early Sufism.” In L. Lewisohn, ed. *Classical Persian Sufism: from its origins to Rūmī*. London and New York, 1993, pp. 583–613.
- . Review of B.R. von-Schlegell, trans. *Principles of Sufism by al-Qushayrī*. *JSAI* 19 (1995): 272–281.
- Al-Ṭabarī, Abū ‘Alī al-Fadl. *I‘lām al-warā bi-a‘lām al-hudā*. Beirut, 1985.
- Taylor, J.B. “Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, Spiritual Forebear of the Sufis.” *Islamic Culture* 40 (1966): 195–206.
- Thibon, Jean-Jacques. “Hiérarchie spirituelle, fonction de saint et hagiographie dans l’oeuvre de Sulamī.” In R. Chih et D. Gril, eds. *Le saint et son milieu*. Cairo, IFAO, 2000, pp. 13–30.
- Tokatly, V. “Three Mamlūk scholars go to war on plagiarism: literary theft in Arabic prose as discussed by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 1448), al-Sakhawī (d. 1497) and al-Suyūṭī (d. 1505),” forthcoming (*JSAI* 31 [2006]).
- Trimingham, J. S. *The Sufi orders in Islam*. Oxford, 1971.
- Al-Ziriklī, Khayr al-Dīn. *al-A‘lām*. Beirut, Dār al-‘ilm li-‘l-malāyīn, 1980 (8 vols.).
- Yāqūt. *Mu‘jam al-buldān*. Wüstenfeld, ed. Leipzig, 1867.